Welcome and Opening Remarks

Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management opened the meeting with a welcome.

Alex Trac, Division Program Planner, DBHS, Sacramento County introduced himself, welcomed the group and reviewed ground rules, the June meeting evaluation, and the goals for the day.

Goals for the day:

- Review and approve Teens and TAY reports
- Make a decision on how to best use investment funds
- Review and define RPC role in implementing the communications plan
- Review and discuss membership applications

Myel welcomed Arden Tucker, a previous member as a guest. She also encouraged everyone to support the facilitation of the meeting with the co-Chairs out.

Review and Action: Teens and TAY Progress Reports

Jane Ann, RPC Member Representing DBHS opened the discussion by reviewing the goal of the discussion: to review and approve the reports, which will release 20% of the grant award to each of the grantees.

She asked the group to keep these 6 points in mind during the review and discussion:

- Are targets being met and context of program implementation?
- Is there evidence of progress or changes in the narrative since last report
- Demographics
- What if grantee is not meeting targets?
- Are there extenuating circumstances that have been described in the narrative that can inform the action to be taken?
- Are they looking to the collaborative for support in addressing challenges?

Myel provided the following context:

- These contracts started in December and that the time you are reviewing includes the launch of services.
- Site visits took place in January or February, and so you've heard a little bit about their services.
- Both grantees have reached and exceeded their unduplicated client target for the period.
- LGBT Center has 2 models of respite. Youth Groups and Drop In.
- Both grantees have staff that reflect the community they are serving
- Both grantees have strong outreach including school based and street
Wind:
- 65% of clients have participated in respite more than once
- They are seeing more young people than they anticipated and so they have made program adjustments to better serve the youth they are seeing. These adjustments were presented to the RPC by WIND staff.

LGBT Center:
- Challenges have been in relation to data collection and performance measures
- They have begun collecting self-reported data and are offering more incentives to encourage youth to complete the surveys
- Myel encouraged them to reach out to Wind and to Leslie Cooksy of TCE for support and ideas.
- They also had the opportunity for support at the March grantee learning community meeting

The RPC members then reviewed the reports, discussed and made decisions on release of funds. Highlights of the discussion follow:

Wind Youth Services:
- While the term of the report is Dec-April they didn’t’ get going until they opened the drop-in center mid January so the number served is in an even more condensed time and so the have had higher demands than anticipated.
- They lost one of their counselors within a month of opening so worked hard with one less staff
- Not looking for support since they asked for approval for shifting their program structure, which they problem-solved on their own and then came to the RPC with their proposal
- Like that they are collaborating with other grantees for referrals
- Good and accessible location
- Love their location on J St.
- A RPC member shared that there was a youth that utilized Wind Services and as a result of a referral and was able to get out of an involuntary hospital situation with the support of Wind
- Effective outreach

Decision: Approve report and release funding unconditionally.

LGBT Center:
- Because they don’t have data it’s hard to assess
- Curious about how many came back for services
- Want to approve
- Discussion questions: Is the target for youth group sessions really 170? Is this target too high? They have groups running throughout the week regularly. They already have had 21 sessions with over 200 youth participate. Want to make sure they can be successful.
• Started with drop-in around Dec. 21 with limited hours and more fully in January. Started groups in January.
• Is a group more than 2? Is there a minimum for the group session? Myel will check with the LGBT center. Don’t know if just one person came to a group if they would count it more as a drop in.
• In specific reference to the LGBTQ community, reaching 2 individuals in one group is a big success because the youth are in need of so much.
• On page number 3 and 4 in regard to performance measures, the Center has had a challenge collecting data and getting youth to participate in evaluation measures. Based on their conversation they should have more data.
• Do they have a sign in sheet? Or a pre and post test? Or self reporting?
• Myel: We do not have copies but we saw drafts of their tools in the site visit.
• They also had a change in staffing early on that might have had an impact on the reporting practices
• Perhaps this group of youth would be hesitant to provide a lot of information because they are queer and this has been a historically stigmatized population
• Can we assist them with ideas for collecting data and over time perhaps clients will build trust. Perhaps facilitated through the grantee-learning group.
• Wind has met with LGBT center and provided some information on tracking the duplicated, unduplicated and referral. There is a little concerned that they haven’t been tracking better. The visit with Wind occurred after the March grantee learning community meeting and before the report was due in June.
• 75% of the Q spot youth are also Wind youth, Wind is able to collect the data among a similar/same population
• This is a start-up and they are reaching quite a few people. Would like to give them a chance to deliver the evaluation
• We need to be mindful of some of the challenges round 1 and 2 grantees had when they were getting started, even with larger organizations
• There has been some great networking with Wind Youth Services
• For the drop-in center their goal was lower than actual number of youth served and visa versa for the groups.
• Would they potentially swap their goals? There is some transition time, so lets let them continue their work
• One member is not hearing on the ground that they are conducting street outreach. Another heard that they are collaborating with another service provider to do street outreach (Foot patrol).
• 62 + 277 is total served, are we sure than none of the drop in folks attended a group?
• Why is there no reflection of data collection even for a few weeks in April?
• Can we ask them for some data by a specific date and not impact this release of funds while letting them know that not having the data in the future will impact future funding.
• Can we see now what data they have collected to date and the instruments they are using? What incentives are they using? How are they training staff to gather that data?
• I don’t want to impact their services, but also concerned it took so long to roll out and no data collection in place
• If their staff haven’t collected data in the past, the staff may not be comfortable asking for this data
Straw poll:
Yes with conditions - 4
Maybe -2

Comments:
- I don’t want to impact their services, but also concerned it took so long to roll out and no data collection in place
- If their staff haven’t collected data in the past, the staff may not be comfortable asking for this data

No - 1

Comments:
- Looks like they are not fully equipped to do this project, do they have credibility for funding? What tools do they have to calculate the numbers, what experience do they have in collecting data? Did they really serve the people?

Members made suggestions for a yes with contingencies and after continued discussion the group came to an agreement.

Decision: Yes with contingencies:
- Want data from April (when they started to collect it) through July by August so can review in September
- Want to see instruments
- With language that the RPC is concerned and If they don’t provide it will impact future release of funds
- Clarify group number target is accurate and doable

Investment Funds
Myel provided some context:
- The funds were pulled from the market bearing account June 30, so we won’t know the amount until July 15.
- Many grantees’ contracts end in September, so we need to make a decision at the July meeting if these funds be distributed to the rounds 1 and round 2 grantees because the August meeting has been cancelled to make time for the Grantee Learning Meeting.
- Set the guidelines about what is not an option (new grants, capacity building for non-grantees)

Shaykh E. B. Abdullah, RPC member, polled the group to determine if, without knowing the amount available, the group wanted to make decisions about how to spend the funds. Myel pointed out that waiting until September will restrict the funds to just round 3 grantees and learning community enhancement. The trade-off of making a decision today is that the funds would benefit all of the grantees.

The group decision was to continue to discuss and make a decision today.

Myel then presented the ideas generated by the co-chairs and staff:
- Take total and split it equally among all grantees and ask them to give them RPC a plan
for how they could use it for capacity building and learning and/or program enhancement

- Opening up learning community to non-grantees. Share learning with other providers to help them gain knowledge and think about respite in the future of their programs (Thru June 2016)

She then asked the group for additional ideas that included:

The group discussed the options:
- What does opening up the learning community have to do with the funds?  
  A: Could be that we bring in speakers, expert that we couldn’t host otherwise?
- So hard to make decisions without the specific information.
- This is a time-limited engagement, to develop entities and mechanisms so that the community can build on this work to continue services. When we look at these extra funds we should consider the possibility to seed the interested in continuing and expanding this work. This work cannot live on the organizations that we have been working with so far.
- Maybe we look at it in a waterfall, minimum this much to this idea and if more, then fund learning community. Do we carve off some for learning and the rest goes to grantees.
- Can we shift more funds to some agencies that are doing better and less to others- Performance based?
- Can talk in percentages for waterfall idea.
- Will there be a closing learning community meeting? All grantees are invited to the round 3 learning community.
- Like splitting equally and encouragement to expand the community such as mentorship and accommodate more into the learning community in order to build capacity. Ex: you get this $ if you mentor 2 organizations in the learning community
- Can we do this with some of the grants ending in September?
- Agree with spit funds
- Agree it should be based on performance
- Some agencies have received no cost extensions. One page proposal to request a specific amount some can opt out.

Summary of Ideas:
- Learning community
- 1 page proposal, reviewed by RPC
- Split based on performance
- One time type of expense, not a sustained program component

Straw poll: Are we going in the direction of splitting among the grantees in some way?  
Yes - 4
No - 2

Straw poll: split it evenly = yes, merit based = no
Yes, 100% goes to grantees, evenly split

Straw poll: With or without proposal? With proposal but no review of proposal (just informational) = yes
Yes – 4
No-3

Evenly split, one time opportunity, one page description of how they will use it (capacity building or program enhancement).
Yes -7

Summary of final decision:
The investment funds will be split evenly among all grantees on an opt-in basis. Grantees can opt-in by providing a one-page description of their plan for the funds. They will have the choice to use it for program enhancement or capacity building.

Communications Plan
Jane Ann, Department of Behavioral Health Services PRC Member set the context, reviewed the components and encouraged everyone to review the plan and prepare for discussion at the September meeting.

Context:
• Grounded in the Innovation Plan and the plan for the next year,
• Present the 3 Innovation questions as written and an explanation of what the questions mean
  o Promotes successful collaboration between public and private organizations in Sacramento Co.
  o Demonstrates a community driven process
  o Improves the quality and outcome of respite services in Sacramento Co.

3 components:
Goals
Objectives
Strategies (Media, engaging stakeholders and RPC website)

Closed Session
Donald McKinley Clark introduced himself.

Vote on Donald Clark
Yes-6
Stand aside - 1

Vote on Kay Temple Kirk
Has attended learning committee meeting
Worthwhile input at last meeting
Yes - 7
Reflection and Wrap Up
Due to time, the group skipped reflections

Before the group left, Myel invited Arden to share her reason for attending the meeting. She spoke of her recent experience at an event that focused on substance abuse and mental health issues. She asked that everyone to keep an open mind to the intersection of these two as the work moves forward and to embrace those with both.

Future Meetings:
Thursday August 20
Tues, Sept 8
Tues Oct 6
Tuesday November 3
Tuesday December 1